

[REDACTED]

404139

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
LOS ALAMOS SCIENTIFIC LABORATORY  
(CONTRACT W-7405-ENG-36)  
P. O. Box 1663  
LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO

13-11-1952  
539

IN REPLY  
REFER TO: J-10892

19 April 1952

This material contains information affecting  
the national defense of the United States  
within the meaning of the Espionage Laws  
Title 18, U.S.C. Sec. 793 and 794,  
and the transmission or revelation of its  
contents in any manner to an unauthorized  
person is prohibited by law.

Dr. Walter D. Claus  
Division, Biology and Medicine  
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission  
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Dr. Claus:

So far as I am aware a final report on the Jangle fall-out studies has not yet been written. I have, however, examined the preliminary report prepared by Shulte and have compared his findings with the predictions of the non-turbulent model for the case of the first Jangle shot. The data are unfortunately very skimpy. Readings of radiation levels were made at several points in the general area of fall-out, but the survey was a long ways from being complete enough to permit a plot of isodose contours. It is consequently difficult to know whether the readings represent levels along the main axis of the fall-out or levels off to the side.

Predictions from the model are conservative except for one experimental point at approximately 160 miles from zero.

Distance (Miles)	Measured Dose (Roentgens)	Predicted Dose (Roentgens)
18	27.	51.
40	2.5	18.
115	0.1	1.4
160	0.28	0.31
235	0.02	0.08

The measured dose was computed from observed radiation rates and the fission fragment decay law ( $t^{-1.2}$ ). The predicted dose was computed from the non-turbulent model with the variable parameters (cloud height, yield, wind velocity, and mean particle size for the shot area soil) pegged to measured values for this shot. The agreement is hardly striking -- just barely order of magnitude. This result is, however, about what could reasonably be expected from the model under the best circumstances. The circumstances for this shot were fairly good -- strong winds, very little shear -- but not ideal. Terrain features strongly affect these low clouds.

OPENNET ENTRY

Authorized for Public Release  
Entered in OpenNet

By: *[Signature]* Date: *4/19/52*

By: **YES** Date: *NOV 23 1953*

Not Authorized for Public Release

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW

DETERMINATION (CIRCLE NUMBER(S))

1. CLASSIFICATION RETAINED

2. CLASSIFICATION CHANGED TO:

3. CONTAINS NO DOE CLASSIFIED INFO

4. COORDINATE WITH:

5. CLASSIFICATION CANCELLED

6. CLASSIFIED INFO BRACKETED

7. OTHER (SPECIFY):

SINGLE REVIEW AUTHORIZED BY: *AA SIMMS/MLL 11/2/44*

REVIEWER (ADD): *M.L. KOLBAM*

NAME: *M.L. KOLBAM*

DATE: *11/28/44*

40432

[REDACTED]

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~  
~~SECRET~~

Dr. Walter Claus

-2-

19 April 1952

So far as future work is concerned I should like to emphasize a few points which I think need more attention than they have received heretofore. Certainly every effort should be made to obtain a complete map of the fall-out. Unfortunately such a map is not only very difficult to make in this inaccessible country but cannot be made by survey parties whose primary concern is public safety. It is also important that we continue to investigate the combined problems of particle-size and specific activity. To my knowledge results so far have been few and ambiguous.

Dr. Bergen Suydam at Los Alamos has recently begun an independent study of fall-out in connection with the use of the Eniwetok Proving Ground. He may be able to offer some further suggestions to assist you in planning your work.

Very truly yours,

*Gaelen L. Felt*  
GAELLEN L. FELT  
J-Division

GLF:lh

Distribution:

- 2 - W. Claus ←
- 1 - W. Ogle
- 1 - G. Felt
- 1 - LASL M&R
- 1 - J-Sequence
- 1 - J-Division

US DOE ARCHIVES 326 U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
RG <u>DOE HISTORIAN (DBM)</u>
Collection <u>1132</u>
Box <u>3362</u>
Folder <u>#10</u>

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~  
~~SECRET~~

DOE ARCHIVES